

REMARKS

Claims 2-10, 12-14, 19-23, 25, 26, 28 and 29 are pending in the application with claims 9, 10, 12, 25, 26, and 28-29 being independent.

Claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, 19-23, 26 and 29 are allowed.

Claims 9, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chraplyvy in view of Hodzic and Heismann.

Each of the various rejections and objections are overcome by amendments that are made to the specification, drawing, and/or claims, as well as, or in the alternative, by various arguments that are presented.

Entry of this Amendment is proper under 37 CFR 1.116 since the amendment: (a) places the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) does not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration since the amendments amplify issues previously discussed throughout prosecution; (c) satisfies a requirement of form asserted in the previous Office Action; (d) does not present any additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims; or (e) places the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. The amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented because it is made in response to arguments raised in the final rejection. Entry of the amendment is thus respectfully requested.

Also, since a dependent claim inherently includes the recitations of the claim or chain of claims from which it depends, it is submitted that the scope and content of any dependent claims that have been herein rewritten in independent form is exactly the same as the scope and content of those claims prior to having been rewritten in independent form. That is, although by convention such rewritten claims are labeled herein as having been "amended," it is submitted that only the format, and not the content, of these claims has been changed. This is true whether a dependent claim has been rewritten to expressly include the limitations of those claims on which it formerly depended or whether an independent claim has been rewritten to include the limitations of claims that previously depended from it. Thus, by such rewriting no equivalent of any subject matter of the original dependent claim is intended to be surrendered. If the Examiner is of a different view, he is respectfully requested to so indicate.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 9, 25 and 28

Claims 9, 25 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Chraplyvy in view of Hodzic and Heismann. The rejection is traversed.

Claims 9-25 and 28 are canceled. Applicants reserve the right to subsequently file one or more continuing applications in order to prosecute the inventions recited in the canceled claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants thank the Examiner for the allowance of claims 2-8, 10, 12-14, 19-23, 26 and 29.

Applicants believe that the record of the prosecution as a whole, including Applicants' specification and claims, provides additional reasons for allowance. The Examiner's Reasons for Allowance do not necessarily state all the reasons for allowance or all the details why the claims are allowed and, therefore, should not be used to interpret the scope of the claims in place of the record of the prosecution as a whole.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Office Action's rejections have been overcome and that this application is now in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and allowance are, therefore, respectfully solicited.

If, however, the Examiner still believes that there are unresolved issues, the Examiner is invited to call Eamon Wall at (732) 842-8110 so that arrangements may be made to discuss and resolve any such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 1/20/10



Eamon J. Wall
Registration No. 39,414
Attorney for Applicants

WALL & TONG, LLP
595 Shrewsbury Avenue, Suite 100
Shrewsbury, New Jersey 07702
Telephone: 732-842-8110
Facsimile: 732-842-8388